

REMARKS

Claims 8-37 have been withdrawn in view of the Examiner's restriction requirement. Therefore, claims 1-7 are all the claims currently pending, of which claim 1 is the only independent claim. The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,345,964 to Cooper ("Cooper '964"), 6,398,525 to Cooper ("Cooper '525") or 5,203,681 to Cooper ("Cooper '681") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,092,821 to Gilbert ("Gilbert '821"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because none of these references teaches at least (1) a keyway formed in a shaft and a projection on a coupling that is received in the keyway, or (2) a connective portion of a rotor that includes flat, shallow threads that receives a second end of a rotor shaft that also has flat, shallow threads. See claim 1 and Figs. 4, 6, 11-13.

The portion of Gilbert '821 referenced by the Examiner describes a connection between an impeller and a rotor shaft. Col. 5, ll. 1-8. A plurality of openings 50 are formed in impeller 14 and in shaft 18. Id.; Fig. 11. Dowels 52 are inserted into the openings and retained by cement. Id. The purpose of this structure is to prevent relative movement between the shaft and impeller. Id. ll. 1-2.

Gilbert '821 does not teach a coupling having a projection, nor does it teach such a projection for being received in the keyway of a shaft as does pending claim 1. Nor would it be obvious to modify Gilbert '821 to arrive at the claimed invention. Gilbert '821 requires a plurality of aligned openings in the shaft and impeller and separate pieces, i.e., dowels, to be fitted into place during assembly. This arrangement and various pieces are more difficult to machine and assemble than the keyway and projection as presently claimed. A coupling assembly and/or shaft as disclosed in the Cooper references would have to be entirely redesigned to accept a plurality of dowels as taught by Gilbert '821, or even to accept a single dowel. Thus, there is no motivation to combine the references and, even if there were, the proposed combination would not yield the coupling with projection/shaft keyway arrangement as claimed by Applicant. See claim 1 and Figs. 4 and 8.

Finally, none of the references include flat, shallow threads as recited in claim 1 and shown in, for example, Figs. 6, 11-13. The flat, shallow threads alleviate breakage of the threads. See Specification ¶ 41.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments herein, reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicant believes the case is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims.

Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any cancelled claims or additional claims, including claims of broader scope, in a continuation application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 19-3878**.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if it would in any way advance prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1-24-07


David E. Rogers
Reg. No. 38287

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
Two Renaissance Square
40 North Central Avenue, Suite 2700
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4498
Telephone: (602) 528-4122
Facsimile: (602) 253-8129

PHOENIX/385502 1